

1 Sheila Polk, SBN 007514
2 County Attorney
3 ycao@co.yavapai.az.us

4 Attorneys for STATE OF ARIZONA

5 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT

6 STATE OF ARIZONA, COUNTY OF YAVAPAI

7 STATE OF ARIZONA,

8 Plaintiff,

9 vs.

10 JAMES ARTHUR RAY,

11 Defendant.

V1300CR201080049

12 **STATE'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S**
13 **MOTION TO EXCLUDE CUMULATIVE**
14 **TESTIMONY PURSUANT TO RULE 403**

15 **(The Honorable Warren Darrow)**

16 The State of Arizona, through undersigned counsel, respectfully files this Response to
17 Defendant's Motion to Exclude Cumulative Testimony Pursuant to Rule 403. Contrary to
18 Defendant's proffer of the testimony of the State's witnesses, the testimony is not cumulative and is
19 necessary to prove the culpable mental state for the crime of Manslaughter. The State has the burden
20 of proof in this case and the testimony at issue is directly relevant to a fact that Defendant has
21 described as "critical" in this case. Finally, Defendant's request that the State's presentation of its
22 case-in-chief be limited in such a manner would violate the victims' right to justice and due process.

23 For the reasons set forth in the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities, Defendant's
24 Motion should be denied.

25 //

26 //

//

SUPERIOR COURT
YAVAPAI COUNTY, ARIZONA

2011 MAY -9 PM 4:18

SANDRA K MARKHAM

CLERK

BY: Ivy Rios ✓

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **Offer of Proof:**

3 As with the previous witnesses who have testified regarding their participation in the 2009
4 Spiritual Warrior event, each participant provides a unique, personal account of what occurred.
5 Participants saw and heard different things depending on where the participant was located and
6 the degree the participant was affected either physically or mentally by the heat. What these
7 witnesses heard and saw corroborates the State's theory of the case, is directly relevant to
8 Defendant's mental state and is not cumulative. The following is an offer of proof of the
9 testimony Defendant seeks to exclude:
10

11 **Kim Binkley:**

12 Kim Brinkley attended Spiritual Warrior 2009 and is expected to testify,
13 among other things, that she sat at the 4 to 5 o'clock position inside the sweat
14 lodge, not far from Defendant; around round 3 or 4, Amy Grimes passed out and
15 fell on top of Kim. Kim called out that Amy had just passed out and was on top of
16 her and called for someone to come get her. Kim will testify that someone helped
17 Amy out. She will also testify that she heard Laura Tucker call out that Liz needs
18 help and heard Defendant respond: Don't worry about Liz, she has done this
19 before; we'll check her out after the round. She heard someone say Kirby was not
20 breathing. She heard Dennis Mehavrer cry out I'm gonna die and heard Defendant
21 respond. Kim will also testify that she heard Gabriella cry out during the last round
22 for God's sake, open the door.

23 **Danielle Granquist:**

24 Danielle Granquist is expected to testify, among other things, that she
25 participated in the Spiritual Warrior 2009 event and was inside the sweat lodge;
26 she achieved an altered state and hallucinated; she sat outside for the last two
rounds, and she pulled Liz Neumann out when the ceremony was over. She also
will testify that she saw James Shore inside but he was too heavy for her to pull
out.

Mark Rock:

Mark Rock was a 2008 Spiritual Warrior Participant and a Dream Team
member in 2009. He is expected to testify, among other things, that he sat next to
Kirby Brown and James Shore, and that he lifted the flap between rounds in order

1 to get air. Near the end of the ceremony, he heard Kirby Brown gurgling, and
2 heard someone say that Kirby was in trouble and needed to get out. He heard
3 Defendant respond that the gate was closing and that we'll deal with it when we're
4 done. If permitted, Mark Rock will also testify about events in 2008.

4 Lisa Rondan:

5 Lisa Rondan was a participant at the 2008 Spiritual Warrior and a Dream
6 Team member in 2009. She is expected to testify, among other things, that in
7 2009, two days prior to the sweat lodge, she asked to be stationed outside because
8 of her experience in 2008 inside the sweat lodge. Ms. Rondan has worked in the
9 past as a nurse. The last time she worked as a nurse was 2004 or 2005 when she
10 worked in oncology and as a birthing nurse. During the events that unfolded in
11 2009, she learned she was being referred to as a "nurse." She is expected to testify
12 that she was not there in the capacity as a nurse. She will testify about the events
13 that occurred in 2009, including that around round 4, John Ebert crawled out the
14 back of the sweat lodge and Defendant stated we don't do that; that Defendant had
15 told participants to expect to purge, to move things out of the body; that when the
16 ceremony was over and James Shore had been pulled out, she checked his pulse
17 and found none; and that she performed CPR on Kirby Brown. If allowed, she will
18 also testify about events in 2008 during Defendant's sweat lodge.

14 Sydney Spencer:

15 Ms. Spencer is a 2009 Participant who sat near Kirby Brown and James
16 Shore inside the sweat lodge. She is expected to testify, among other things, that
17 when the heat became unbearable, she tried to slide her fingers under the edge of
18 the flap to get air, without success. She remembers round six, then passed out and
19 woke up in ICU at the Flagstaff Medical Center.

18 Dawn Gordon:

19 Dawn Gordon is a 2009 Spiritual Warrior Participant who sat right next to
20 Sidney Spencer, Kirby Brown and James Shore. She is expected to testify, among
21 other things, that James Shore dragged Sidney Spencer out and then came back in.
22 James Shore then called out that we need help over here to get her out, referring to
23 Kirby Brown. Defendant responded that we'll deal with her after the next round.
24 James Shore then pulled up the edge of the sweat lodge but Defendant yelled out
25 who's got a light on? That's sacrilegious!

24 Sean Ronan:

25 Mr. Ronan was a 2009 Spiritual Warrior Participant. He passed out inside
26 the sweat lodge and was dragged out the side after the sweat lodge was over. He is
expected to testify, among other things, that Megan Fredrickson told Defendant
around round 3 or 5 that these people are your responsibility.

1 **Legal Argument:**

2 **I. The witnesses' testimony is not cumulative.**

3
4 As noted above, each of the above witnesses has relevant testimony directly relating to the
5 victims and Defendant while in the sweat lodge. Contrary to Defendant's claim, the expected
6 testimony is not cumulative. "Cumulative evidence merely augments or tends to establish a point
7 already proved by other evidence." *State v. Kennedy*, 122 Ariz. 22, 26, 592 P.2d 1288, 1293
8 (App. 1979) citing *State v. Turner*, 92, Ariz. 214, 375 P.2d 567 (1962). To accept Defendant's
9 claim is to accept that the proffered evidence is already proven. That is not the case. In contrast,
10 "corroborative evidence tends to corroborate or to confirm." *Kennedy, supra*. See also *State v.*
11 *Allen*, 157 Ariz. 165, 176, 755 P.2d 1153, 1164 (1988) ("Corroborative evidence makes a
12 statement more reliable because it increases the likelihood that the statement is true."). Each of
13 the witnesses' testimony as proffered above serves to confirm what occurred in the sweat lodge
14 and is corroborative, not cumulative.

15
16 "[R]elevant evidence" means evidence having a "tendency" to
17 make the existence of a fact of consequence more or less probable.
18 Rule 401 *Ariz. R. Evid.* Evidence is relevant if it has any basis in
19 reason to prove a material fact in issue or if it tends to cast light on
20 the crime charged. *State v. Moss*, 119 Ariz. 4, 579 P.2d 42 (1978).

21 *State v. Adamson*, 136 Ariz. 250, 261, 665 P.2d 972, 983 (1983).

22 The defense has repeatedly challenged the State's witnesses as to what they heard in the
23 sweat lodge. As described by Mr. Li, this "is a critical point that is highly disputed in this case."¹
24 The State has the burden to prove every element of the offense and this testimony is relevant to
25 establish the facts and the requisite mental state. See *State v. Edmisten*, 220 Ariz. 517, 520-21,
26

¹ See attachment A, Partial Transcript of April 26, 2011 at 22:10-17.

207 P.3d 770, 773-74 (App. 2009) ("As a general matter, the burden in a criminal trial is on the state to prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. This burden includes any required mental state.") The State should not be denied the right to present this corroborative information.

II. The State has significantly reduced its list of witnesses.

The State's original witness list consisted of seventy witnesses. The State has now called twenty-six witnesses in forty-two trial days. The forty-two trial days include the six days for jury selection and two trial days where no witnesses testified either due to juror illness (Day 27 -April 5), or oral argument (Day 31- April 14). Considering only the actual days where testimony was presented, the testimony of twenty-six witnesses has been completed in thirty-four days.²

Prior to trial, the State estimated two witnesses per day would testify. On October 4, 2010, the State informed the Court that it would need sixty trial days to present its case (*Exhibit B, R.T., 10/4/10* at 5:22-23); the defense estimated they needed two weeks for the defense case (*Id.* at 6:2-3). On that date, the Court scheduled the trial to begin on February 16, 2011 and to last sixty-five days. The sixty-five days included the days necessary for jury selection. *See Exhibit C, Minute Entry, 10/4/10.*

III. Additional Trial Days Are Needed

Given the current schedule, including the loss of seven days scheduled for defense counsel's vacation, the current projected end date is unrealistic. The State anticipates calling ten to thirteen additional witnesses in its case-in chief. This is significantly less than the number of witnesses the State originally scheduled. Justice is best served by adding trial days and not excluding critical relevant evidence for either party. The State believes it is necessary to conduct

² Additional time has also been lost, though not included in the number of computed trial days, due to juror illness and to allow the defense time to interview Mr. Haddow as a result of the State's late disclosure. (April 12, 13, 15, 19 and May 3).

1 a careful polling of the jury to determine the availability of jurors beyond the scheduled end date.
2 With reasonable accommodation to juror plans, it may be possible to extend the trial days. *See*
3 *State v. Aquilar*, 217 Ariz. 235, 240, 172 P.3d 423, 428 (App. 2007) (Finding the trial court erred
4 in not investigating further “whether four jurors had legitimate reasons for their unavailability or
5 whether it was simply more convenient to have their duties concluded immediately.”)
6

7 **IV. This Court should consider the victims’ constitutional rights to justice and due**
8 **process in determining the appropriate course of action.**

9 The Arizona Constitution provides that a victim of a crime has a right to justice and due
10 process. In order to preserve and protect these rights, a victim of a crime has a right to be treated
11 with fairness, respect, and dignity throughout the criminal justice process. Ariz. Const. Art. II,
12 §2.1(A)(1). Under Art. II, §2.1(10) and (11), a victim has a constitutional right to “a speedy trial
13 or disposition and to “have all rules governing criminal procedure and the admissibility of
14 evidence in all criminal proceedings protect victim’s rights....”
15

16 The Arizona Supreme Court has recognized that courts are obligated to protect the rights
17 set forth in the Victims’ Bill of Rights. *State v. Mata*, 185 Ariz. 319, 337, 916 P.2d 1035, 1053
18 (1996). Courts must follow the plain language of the Victims’ Bill of Rights. *Knapp v. Martone*,
19 170 Ariz. 237, 239, 823 P.2d 685, 687 (1992). Further, A.R.S. § 13-4418 provides that these laws
20 are to be “liberally construed to preserve and protect the rights to which victims are entitled.”
21

22 The State respectfully requests that this Court deny Defendant’s Motion to Preclude the
23 State’s witnesses, which would restrict the State’s ability to present its case to the jury, and would
24 ignore the victims’ right to justice and due process.

25 //

26 //

Office of the Yavapai County Attorney

255 E. Gurley Street

Prescott, AZ 86301

Phone: (928) 771-3344 Facsimile: (928) 771-3110

1 RESPECTFULLY submitted this 9th day of May, 2011.

2 SHEILA SULLIVAN POLK
3 YAVAPAI COUNTY ATTORNEY

4
5 Sheila Sullivan Polk

6 **COPIES** of the foregoing delivered this
7 9th day of May, 2011, to

8 Hon. Warren Darrow
9 Judge of the Superior Court

10 Thomas Kelly
11 Truc Do

12 Attorney for Defendant

13
14 By: Kathy Darrow
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA
2 FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI
3

4 STATE OF ARIZONA,)
5 Plaintiff,)
6 vs.) Case No. V1300CR201080049
7 JAMES ARTHUR RAY,)
8 Defendant.)
9 _____)

10
11
12
13
14 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
15 BEFORE THE HONORABLE WARREN R. DARROW
16 TRIAL DAY THIRTY-SIX
17 APRIL 26, 2011
18 Camp Verde, Arizona
19 (Partial transcript.)
20
21
22
23

24 REPORTED BY
25 MINA G. HUNT
 AZ CR NO. 50619
 CA CSR NO. 8335

1 is going to be?

2 MR. HUGHES: Your Honor, I believe that Fawn
3 is going to -- that Fawn said something along the
4 lines of that she had overheard that people were
5 unconscious inside and that Mr. Ray had the door
6 closed and continued with the round.

7 MR. LI: That's hearsay, Your Honor, and
8 that's actually extraordinarily prejudicial. It's
9 exactly the issue we were arguing about when
01:50:29PM 10 Ms. Polk was asking questions of Debbie Mercer to
11 exactly what was said inside this. She has no idea
12 what Ms. Foster said. If Ms. Foster wanted to
13 testify about what she said, she could have
14 testified.

15 THE COURT: She did testify about what she
16 said.

17 MR. LI: So she's already testified. But she
18 didn't say people were unconscious. And also this
19 is classic hearsay. It is literally being offered
01:50:51PM 20 for the truth of the matter.

21 MR. HUGHES: I believe it's an excited
22 utterance, which is a well-accepted exception to
23 the hearsay rule.

24 MR. LI: It's also inadmissible under 403.
25 This is not an excited utterance. And also this is

1 classic hearsay. This witness is being offered to
2 testify about what another witness said about what
3 she observed. Your Honor, this is a critical
4 point.

5 THE COURT: Mr. Li.

6 MR. LI: Sorry.

7 THE COURT: I mean go ahead. I don't want to
8 cut you off in making a record if you have
9 additional record to make.

01:51:33PM

10 MR. LI: I appreciate it. If I may make a
11 record. It is a critical point that's highly
12 disputed in this case. It was a subject of a lot
13 of arguing with respect to what testimony Ms. Polk
14 was soliciting from Debbie Mercer and from Fawn
15 Foster. And having this other person testify about
16 what she heard someone else say she heard is
17 classic hearsay. It's also 403.

18 THE COURT: It's offered as an excited
19 utterance. As to foundation, I'm going to sustain
20 at this time.

01:52:15PM

21 Mr. Li, I'm looking at the excited
22 utterance exception. Thank you.

23 Sustained as to foundation at this point.

24 (End of sidebar conference.)

25 (Sidebar conference.)

1 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA
2 FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI

3

4 STATE OF ARIZONA,)
)
5 Plaintiff,)
)
6 vs.) Case No. V1300CR201080049
)
7 JAMES ARTHUR RAY,)
)
8 Defendant.)
)

9

10

11

12

13

14 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
15 BEFORE THE HONORABLE WARREN R. DARROW
16 TELEPHONIC PRETRIAL CONFERENCE

17 OCTOBER 4, 2010

18 Camp Verde, Arizona

19

20

21

22

23

24 REPORTED BY
 MINA G. HUNT
25 AZ CR NO. 50619
 CA CSR NO. 8335

Mina G. Hunt (928) 554-8522

1 APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:

2 For the Plaintiff:

3 YAVAPAI COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
 4 BY: SHEILA SULLIVAN POLK, ATTORNEY
 5 BY: BILL R. HUGHES, ATTORNEY
 255 East Gurley
 6 Prescott, Arizona 86301-3868
 (Appearances by telephone.)

7 For the Defendant:

8 THOMAS K. KELLY, PC
 9 BY: THOMAS K. KELLY, ATTORNEY
 425 East Gurley
 10 Prescott, Arizona 86301-0001
 (Appearance by telephone.)

11 MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP
 12 BY: LUIS LI, ATTORNEY
 13 BY: TRUC DO, ATTORNEY
 355 South Grand Avenue
 14 Thirty-fifth Floor
 Los Angeles, California 90071-1560
 (Appearances by telephone.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Proceedings had before the Honorable
2 WARREN R. DARROW, Judge, taken on Monday, October 4,
3 2010, at Yavapai County Superior Court, Division Pro
4 Tem B, 2840 North Commonwealth Drive, Camp Verde,
5 Arizona, before Mina G. Hunt, Certified Reporter
6 within and for the State of Arizona.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 THE COURT: I'm going to call the case -- we're
3 in open court. There is the another matter I
4 interrupted. That's fine. We have this set for
5 3:00 o'clock. I'll resume that other matter in a
6 moment.

7 Right now this is V1300CR201080049, State
8 versus James Arthur Ray. I have the telephonic
9 appearances. Really the purpose of today's
10 conference or hearing is to get a trial date set.
11 That's my understanding anyway.

12 Was there anything else that needed to be
13 discussed today?

14 MS. DO: Your Honor, we'd also like to schedule
15 the hearing regarding the monetary sanctions in
16 connection with the motion to compel.

17 THE COURT: I'm going to hold off in setting
18 anything just because the other matter I am
19 conducting over in Prescott. I just am not able to
20 set things right now. I can't say anything more
21 than that in terms of timing. Because I'm not sure
22 of the timing of things. I understand you're making
23 a request now. That's something I'm not going to be
24 able to set today.

25 MS. DO: All right, Your Honor.

1 MS. POLK: This is Sheila Polk. Does the
2 defendant waive his presence for this hearing?

3 THE COURT: Ms. Do or Tom Kelly. What about
4 Mr. Ray's appearance?

5 MS. DO: Yes.

6 THE COURT: Ms. Do is saying yes. It's
7 waived. After I set the date, I'm going to ask that
8 there be an affidavit from Mr. Ray acknowledging the
9 trial time and also really the matters that are
10 covered in Rule 9.1.

11 MR. KELLY: Judge, we will take care of that.

12 This is Tom Kelly.

13 THE COURT: I know I've already made the
14 advisement consistent with Rule 9.1. What needs to
15 be verified now is actual notice of the trial date.
16 Why don't I go ahead and address that. Let me ask
17 the parties again the number of trial days that are
18 requested.

19 Ms. Polk?

20 MS. POLK: Judge, can I have a moment, please?

21 THE COURT: Yes.

22 MS. POLK: Judge, at this point our best guess
23 is 60 trial days.

24 THE COURT: I think we had 56 days.

25 Ms. Do, Mr. Kelly?

1 MR. KELLY: Judge I'm going to defer to Ms. Do.

2 MS. DO: Our estimate of the defense case is
3 two weeks.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 And, Ms. Polk, were you talking about just
6 the state's case, and then I suppose adding some
7 time for rebuttal, or the 60 days was the estimate
8 of just the state's case?

9 MS. POLK: Judge, yes. We're trying to
10 anticipate cross-examination. But yes. Just the
11 state's case.

12 THE COURT: As I've indicated before, I guess
13 it was 56 days. At this time, anyway, I'm going to
14 set the trial for a total of 65 days. As we get
15 closer, as we consider jury selection matters, I
16 will look more carefully at the time. But at this
17 point 65 days.

18 And what I'm going to do is what I did
19 last time, which is announce a first day of trial.
20 And then just indicate it would be my intention to
21 use every day of the week possible to conduct the
22 trial rather than having three-day trial weeks and
23 then just extending the trial even longer in terms
24 of the number of weeks involved, to try to use every
25 day available for trial. Which would mean all days

1 of the week except Monday.

2 And then if there is a holiday that falls
3 on a Monday, then the trial would have just three
4 days that particular week. It would be Wednesday.
5 But other than that time, it would be beginning on
6 Tuesday.

7 Is that consistent with what the parties
8 would want to do as well, just to have trial as many
9 days as possible?

10 MS. POLK: Yes.


11 MS. DO: Yes for the defense, Your Honor.

12 THE COURT: Okay. Then I did have the request
13 that trial start mid February. So I'm going to
14 order that trial begin on Wednesday, February 16,
15 2011. February 16, 2011.

16 And trial time will be, we'll say,
17 10:00 a.m. on February 16, pretrial conference
18 8:30 a.m. I know we have other matters to
19 consider. And I'm going to confirm some hearing
20 times, in a minute, in November.

21 But I'm going to set that first day of
22 trial and then just issue a minute entry that will
23 have the specific days listed, as I've outlined.
24 Basically, four-day trial weeks when possible. And
25 I will do that.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI



DIVISION PRO TEM B
HON. WARREN R. DARROW
CASE NO. V1300CR20108 0049

JEANNE HICKS, CLERK
BY: Rhondi Hagen, Deputy Clerk
DATE: October 4, 2010

TITLE:
STATE OF ARIZONA,

(Plaintiff)

v

JAMES ARTHUR RAY,

(Defendant [D- 1])

COUNSEL:

Yavapai County Attorney (via OnBase)
By Sheila Polk / Bill Hughes / Steven Sisneros

(For Plaintiff)

Thomas K. Kelly (e)
(Co-Counsel for Defendant)
Luis Li / Brad Brian / Truc Do
MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON LLP
355 South Grand Avenue Thirty-Fifth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560
(Co-Counsel for Defendant, *Pro Hac Vice*)

HEARING ON:	NATURE OF PROCEEDINGS	COURT REPORTER
TELEPHONIC STATUS CONFERENCE		Mina Hunt

START TIME: 3:12 p.m.

TELEPHONIC APPEARANCES: Sheila Polk, Counsel for State
Bill Hughes, Co-Counsel for State
Thomas Kelly, Co-Counsel for Defendant
Truc Do, Co-Counsel for Defendant *Pro Hac Vice*
Luis Li, Co-Counsel for Defendant *Pro Hac Vice*
Pam Moreton, Victim Representative

The Defendant's appearance is waived. Counsel Do requests a hearing on the issue of monetary sanctions on the Motion to Compel. The Court is unable to schedule a hearing at this time and requests that Counsel submit any requests for hearing in writing.

The Court instructs Counsel for Defendant to submit to the Court an Affidavit from Defendant acknowledging the Trial time and the matters covered in Rule 9.1. Counsel Kelly states he will comply.

Discussion regarding length of trial.

IT IS ORDERED setting Jury Trial commencing on Wednesday, February 16, 2011 at 10:00 a.m. with a Pretrial Conference at 8:30 a.m. with 65 days allotted. Trial days will be Tuesday through Friday. If a holiday should fall on a Monday, the Trial days will be Wednesday through Friday.

October 4, 2010

Discussion ensues regarding deadlines and disclosure. Counsel Do avows that Defense Counsel are in compliance with disclosure.

Counsel are informed that the Court will set a motions deadline in mid-January, 2011. Counsel are further advised that the Court will follow the Rules of Criminal Procedure and the case will be heard on the merits consistent with the Rules.

IT IS ORDERED confirming Evidentiary Hearing set on November 9, 10 and 16, 2010.

IT IS ORDERED confirming the existing release conditions.

END TIME: 3:26 p.m.

THEREAFTER, off the record, IT IS ORDERED setting the following Trial Schedule:

FEBRUARY 2011	16, 17, 18, 23, 24, 25
MARCH 2011	1, 2, 3, 4 8, 9, 10, 11 15, 16, 17, 18 22, 23, 24, 25 29, 30, 31 and April 1
APRIL 2011	5, 6, 7, 8 12, 13, 14, 15 19, 20, 21, 22 26, 27, 28, 29
MAY 2011	3, 4, 5, 6 10, 11, 12, 13 17, 18, 19, 20 24, 25, 26, 27
JUNE 2011	1, 2, 3 7, 8, 9 and 10

IT IS ORDERED setting Motions deadline as Tuesday, January 18, 2011.

cc: Gallagher & Kennedy, P.C., Counsel for Shore Family, 2575 East Camelback Road, Phoenix, AZ 85016 (e)
Murphy Schmitt Hathaway & Wilson, PLLC, Co-Counsel for Brown Family (e)
Stone & Magnanini, Co-Counsel for Brown Family, 150 John F. Kennedy Pkwy 4th Floor, Short Hills, NJ 07078
Aspey Watkins & Diesel, PLLC, Counsel for Neuman Family (e)
Steptoe & Johnson, Counsel for KPNX Broadcasting Company (e)
Perkins, Cole, Brown & Bain, Counsel for KTVK-TV, 2901 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2000, Phoenix, AZ 85012-2788

Victim Services (e)
Division PT-B (e)
Court Administration
Jeanne Hicks, Clerk of Court
Customer Service Supervisor, Verde